DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 051 754 HE 002 229

AUTHOR	Witheiler, Paula
TITLE	Course Evaluations at Hofstra University - Spring 1969.
INSTITUTION	Hofstra Univ., Hempstead, N.Y. Center for the Study of Higher Education.
REPORT NO	R-94
PUB DATE	Apr 71
NOTE	14p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Course Evaluation, *Courses, *Higher Education, *Student Evaluation, Student Participation
IDENTIFIERS	*Hofstra University

ABSTRACT

This paper presents information on course evaluations that took place at Hofstra University in the spring of 1969. Data is presented on courses scheduled and the percentage of those who participated in the evaluations by school, department, and by course level for both fall and spring semesters. Evaluative student responses to items pertaining to various aspects of courses on a university and individual school basis are also given. The findings indicate that 64 percent of the 1,893 courses were evaluated, that participation ranged from 0 percent in some departments to 100 percent in the American Studies and other programs. On the average, graduate courses received the highest percentage of above average ratings for all items, with the exception of course items. Other evaluated items were: the instructor, the text, students, and general. (AF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED051754

Report No. 94
April 1971

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY

Course Evaluations at Hofstra University - Spring 1969

Paula Witheiler

The second series of university-wide course evaluations at Hofstra University took place in May 1969. Form 2A which is a revision of Form 2 (Fall 1968) was used. The revised questionnaire added items appropriate for art courses, lab courses, workshops, and seminars, as well as a question soliciting students' opinion of course evaluations.

Participation. As shown in Table 1, the percentages of courses participating in the spring evaluation were significantly lower for the University as a whole, and for the different schools, levels, and divisions of the University (except the Division of Science) than they had been for the first evaluation (HCLAS Report #90). Sixty-four percent of 1,893 courses were evaluated during the spring of 1969. A total of 20,428 completed answer sheets were returned by more than 85% of the students registered in those courses. All departments that received evaluation material participated in the program to some extent. (Due to a change in university requirements for Physical Education, the men's Physical Education department decided against participation.)

Table 2 shows the number of scheduled courses and the percentages that participated in the evaluations, by schools and departments, and by level of course, for both the fall and spring semesters. At all levels combined (last column), the percentages of courses participating in the spring semester ranged from a high of 100% of the offered courses to a low of 0%. About 13% of the 54 departments had relatively low participation rates (seven departments had return rates that were more than one standard deviation below the participation mean of the university). Comparisons of the total participation rates of the 50 departments that took part in both the spring and fall evaluations, (indicated by asteriks) show that for 35 (70%) of them, the rate of participation tended to be lower in the spring than it had been during the first evaluation, for eight (16%) the rate improved slightly and for seven (14%) there was no change.

The average participation rates of all courses evaluated during the spring semester in the several schools and programs ranged from 76% for the School of Business to 47% for the combined LAS programs. The 28 departments within HCLAS had an average course participation rate of 60% with a range of 11% to 100%. Course participation rates for the six departments of the School of Business averaged 76% and ranged from 39% to 92%, while the range for parti-

HE002 229

Table 1

Comparison of Fall and Spring Participation Rates of Courses
Within the University and
its Schools, Levels, Divisions and Units

	Fall 1968		Spring 1969		
	Total Courses N	Percent Participation	Total Courses N	Percent Participation	Significance of Difference
University	1,796	75%	1,893	64%	.01
Schools (all levels)					
HCLAS	1,205	71%	1,305	60%	.01
School of Business	167	86%	156	76%	.05
School of Education	308	84%	317	75%	.05
Levels					
Introductory Courses	666	77%	612	70%	.05
Other Undergraduate Courses	814	75%	942	63%	.01
Graduate Courses	316	68%	339	59%	.05
Divisions					
Humanities	460	78%	475	61%	.01
Social Sciences	407	74%	400	67%	.05
Sciences	329	54%	347	48%	NS
Units					
LAS I	37	49%	37	46%	NS
LAS II	34	71%	33	48%	NS
LAS I and II	71	59%	70	47%	NS

Pages 3 & 4

Table 2
Use of Course Evaluations - Fall and Spring Semesters 1968 - 1969
Number of Courses Scheduled and Percentage Participation of Courses
by Schools and Departments, Cross-tabulated by Course Level

	Course Level: Introductory				Undergraduate				Graduate				Total			
	N		%		N		%		N		%		N		%	
	'68	'69	'68	'69	'68	'69	'68	'69	'68	'69	'68	'69	'68	'69	'68	'69
University Average	666	612	77	70	814	942	75	63	316	339	68	59	1796	1893	75	64
HCLAS Average	468	459	77	70	626	724	72	59	111	122	46	34	1205	1305	71	60
American Studies						1		100						1		100
Anthropology	11	11	100	64	5	7	80	14	4	3	75	33	20	21	90	43*
Biology	37	35	32	37	24	32	38	38	9	9	56	11	70	76	37	34*
Chemistry	17	19	70	53	18	20	50	40	-	-	-	-	35	39	60	46*
Drama	-	3		100	-	29		72	-	7	-	43	-	39		69
Economics	45	33	56	64	29	26	72	81	5	6	40	0	79	65	61	65*
Eng'g Science	12	6	50	67	32	56	62	36	0	-	0	-	64	62	59	39*
English	54	53	83	74	108	109	87	64	9	11	78	54	171	173	85	66*
Fine Arts	5	7	80	57	59	72	81	53	-	-	-	-	64	79	81	53*
Foreign Language	34	34	94	85	18	20	39	45	4	4	50	0	56	58	73	66*
French	27	22	96	73	8	9	100	78	3	3	67	67	38	34	95	74*
General Language	-	-	-	-	8	8	87	87	2	2	100	50	10	10	90	80*
Geography	9	10	89	90	3	6	100	83	-	-	-	-	12	16	92	88*
Geology	8	7	50	43	6	9	50	44	4	1	0	0	18	17	33	41*
History	36	38	100	92	38	40	76	57	8	6	38	17	82	84	83	70*
Humanities	1	1	100	100	-	-	-	-	4	6	75	50	5	7	80	57*
Mathematics	25	24	96	79	46	48	93	81	9	9	33	22	80	81	87	74*
Music	14	19	78	37	58	53	40	30	1	1	0	0	73	73	46	32*
Natural Science	8	8	38	12	-	-	-	-	1	1	100	0	9	9	44	11*
Philosophy	20	19	100	79	12	17	67	82	1	2	0	0	33	38	85	76*
Phy. and Astronomy	23	26	39	54	34	32	62	47	5	5	20	20	62	63	50	48*
Political Science	14	11	86	100	20	20	100	90	4	2	0	50	38	33	84	91*
Psychology	21	20	90	65	45	48	64	52	29	26	45	42	95	94	64	52*
Social Science	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	5	60	40	5	5	60	40*
Social Science & Religion	3	2	100	100	5	3	60	100	-	-	-	-	8	5	75	100*
Sociology	14	14	93	78	20	24	90	71	1	1	0	0	35	39	88	72*
Spanish	30	29	87	96	10	10	90	70	3	2	33	50	43	41	84	88*
Speech	-	8	-	100	-	25	-	100	-	10	-	50	-	43	-	88
LAS I & LAS II Average	71	70	59	47	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	71	70	59	47*
LAS I Average	37	37	49	46	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37	37	49	46
English	13	13	85	85	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	13	85	85
Freshman Sem.	6	6	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	6	0	0
History	12	12	8	17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	12	8	17
Social Science	6	6	100	67	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	6	100	67
LAS II Average	34	33	71	48	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34	33	71	48
Biology	8	7	62	57	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	7	62	57
English	6	6	100	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	6	100	100
Freshman Sem.	6	6	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	6	0	0
Humanities	7	7	87	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	7	87	0
Social Science	7	7	100	86	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	7	100	86
Freshman Seminar	45	4	78	50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	48	4	78	50*
School of Business Average	55	54	87	85	80	75	87	76	32	27	78	59	167	156	86	76
Accounting, Business Law and Business Writing	19	19	84	79	31	23	81	65	2	2	100	0	52	44	83	68*
Business Statistics	8	8	100	100	11	12	82	75	5	5	100	80	24	25	92	84*
Finance	14	16	86	87	8	7	88	100	5	4	100	75	27	27	89	89*
General Business	5	3	100	67	6	7	100	28	11	8	45	38	22	18	73	39*
Management	5	4	100	100	15	17	93	100	7	6	86	67	27	27	92	92*
Marketing	4	4	50	75	9	9	100	78	2	2	100	100	15	15	87	80*
School of Education Average	27	25	100	92	108	102	85	71	173	190	81	76	308	317	84	75
Counselor Ed.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	12	75	75	12	12	75	75*
Ed. Administration	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	36	81	94	32	36	81	94*
Ed. Psychology	-	-	-	-	15	13	93	92	12	9	25	44	27	22	63	73*
Elem. Ed.	-	-	-	-	46	44	83	54	35	34	97	68	81	78	88	60*
Foundations of Education	13	15	100	93	7	6	71	83	14	12	93	75	34	33	91	85*
Instr. Communication	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	0	7	7	100	71	7	8	100	62*
Reading	14	10	100	90	4	4	100	100	21	33	100	94	39	47	100	94*
Secondary Education	-	-	-	-	29	25	83	76	26	28	73	75	55	53	78	75*
Special Education	-	-	-	-	7	9	100	89	14	19	57	42	21	28	71	57*
Physical Education - Women	-	15	-	87	-	5	-	100	-	21	-	81	-	41	-	85

*Departments that participated in 1968 and 1969 evaluations.

cipation of courses offered in the nine departments of the School of Education was 57% to 94% with an average rate of 75%. The mean course participation rates by divisions within HCLAS were: Social Sciences 67%, Humanities 61% and Sciences 48%.

As in the first evaluation, participation tended to decline as level of courses increased so that the poorest participation was at the graduate level. Fifty-nine percent of the graduate courses, 63% of the undergraduate courses, and 70% of the introductory courses participated in the program.

University Profiles

The Form 2A questionnaire included 46 items designed to elicit students' opinions of various aspects of a course. Respondents were instructed to rate each item on a five-point continuum going from very high to very low. For the purposes of analysis, the top two of the five possible ratings were combined to give the percentage of students who gave above average responses to items 1-16 and 25-46. The percentage who gave a response rating of three was used for those items where this was the best response (items 17-24). Machine print-outs of evaluation results on individual courses were sent only to the instructors of those courses. Following the same procedure used during the first evaluation, data from all participating courses were combined and separate norms were calculated for each of the following: undergraduate introductory courses, all other undergraduate courses, and graduate courses, for each department, each school, and for the university as a whole. The resulting profiles were sent to department chairmen and deans of the various schools.

Table 3 indicates how the responding students in the entire university evaluated undergraduate introductory courses, other undergraduate courses, and graduate courses. Students' ratings of courses in the spring semester closely followed the pattern established in the fall evaluation; graduate school courses received higher percentages of above average ratings than undergraduate school courses. From Table 3 it can be seen that for all but three of the 38 items (#'s 37, 39, 46) whose better than average ratings were examined, the percentages became larger as the level of courses increased, so that we find the smallest percentages at the level of introductory courses and the largest percentages at the graduate level, with the other undergraduate courses somewhere in between. For 34 of these 35 items the differences between introductory and graduate courses were significant at the .05 level or better, (#40 approaches significance) indicating that differences this large could be expected by chance only 5 times out of 100.

The course evaluation questionnaire has five parts; each will be analyzed separately in the sections to follow.

Table 3

University Profile

Percentage of University Respondents Rating Form 2A Items Above Average for Introductory Courses, all other Undergraduate and Graduate Courses Fall 1968, Spring 1969

	Introductory		Undergraduate		Graduate	
	1968	1969	1968	1969	1968	1969
Number of Participants	(9165)	(8112)	(8144)	(8842)	(3051)	(3474)
Part I Instructor Mean	60	63	63	67	67	71
1. Presentation of subject matter	57	63	60	64	62	68
2. Organization of lectures	59	65	62	64	60	67
3. Command of subject matter	79	81	82	83	85	84
4. Enthusiasm for subject	77	81	80	81	84	85
5. Enthusiasm for teaching	69	72	71	74	78	81
6. Interest in students	62	65	63	68	68	74
7. Creates classroom situation conducive to learning	54	58	56	62	59	68
8. Creates classroom situation conducive to discussions	51	58	58	65	68	72
9. Creates classroom situation conducive to questioning	58	63	61	69	68	72
10. Availability of teacher out of class	53	52	55	58	54	54
11. Consideration of opposing views	60	59	63	65	71	71
12. Stimulates students' interest	50	53	54	59	60	67
13. Quality of lectures	51	54	56	57	56	61
Part II Text Mean	25	24	29	28	33	32
14. Cost of text	19	18	20	21	26	26
15. Clarity of presentation of text	32	31	36	34	38	37
16. Interest level of text	24	23	30	29	34	33
Part III Course Mean	60	62	60	60	59	58
17. Class participation	51	58	55	61	55	57
18. Class lectures	62	64	61	64	57	60
19. Number of tests	64	70	67	65	66	66
20. Quality of tests	56	58	55	54	55	54
21. Grading	64	64	60	60	58	59
22. Level of presentation of text	60	60	61	60	59	56
23. Length of assignments	63	65	67	63	63	58
24. Time necessary for preparation for this course	58	58	58	56	57	55

(continued)

Table 3 (continued)

	Introductory 1968	Introductory 1969	Undergraduate 1968	Undergraduate 1969	Graduate 1968	Graduate 1969
Part IV Student Mean	39	40	45	47	53	53
25. Prepared daily assignments well	36	36	42	43	47	50
26. Did much of the suggested supplementary work	30	29	36	35	46	44
27. Did much unassigned and independent course-related work	18	19	25	28	36	35
28. Participated in class discussions	34	34	37	40	46	47
29. Asked questions in class	49	51	55	57	60	61
30. Attempted to make relationships between old and new material within this course	54	57	61	65	66	66
31. Attempted to make relationships between this course and others	50	51	60	63	68	67
32. Amount learned	51	55	56	61	56	63
Part V General Mean	*	35	*	38	*	41
33. How adequate were the facilities for this course	*	45	*	45	*	50
34. Were the facilities available when you needed them	*	44	*	43	*	49
35. How often was an instructor present	*	79	*	81	*	86
36. Time allowed to complete work in class	*	49	*	49	*	51
37. How much individual instruction was available during class time	*	30	*	33	*	28
38. If there were field trips, how much did you learn from them	*	6	*	9	*	9
39. If this was part of a course, how well was it integrated with the rest of the course	*	14	*	15	*	14
40. If this was part of a course, how much did it contribute to your learning the subject	*	14	*	15	*	15
41. How often did you use the Hofstra library for this course	*	22	*	36	*	41
42. If you used the library, how adequate was it	*	30	*	39	*	49

(continued)

Table 3 (continued)

	Introductory 1968	Introductory 1969	Undergraduate 1968	Undergraduate 1969	Graduate 1968	Graduate 1969
43. How did your interest in this subject change as a result of this course	*	49	*	58	*	64
44. Rate your overall general impression of this course by comparing it with all your other college courses	42	45	46	53	48	56
45. Should this course be required	*	31	*	36	*	48
46. How meaningful are course evaluations at Hofstra	*	26	*	25	*	26

* Item was not included in 1968 questionnaire Form 2.

Instructors. The pattern of responses to instructor items for the three levels closely paralleled the fall, except that the percentages were higher in the spring*. The mean percentages of above average ratings for instructor items in the spring were: introductory level, 63%, other undergraduate level, 67%, and graduate level, 71%, whereas they were 60%, 63% and 67% for those levels in the fall.

The data in Table 3 indicate that the instructor characteristics rated above average by the largest percentage of students at all levels were "the command of subject matter" (#3) and "enthusiasm for subject" (#4). At the graduate level more than 80% of the student respondents gave "enthusiasm for teaching" (#5) a better than average rating. Within each level the students in the spring seemed to perceive their teachers in about the same way as did the students in the fall, for there was still a much larger percentage of students giving above average ratings to the teachers' "command of the subject matter" than to the "quality of his lectures" (#13). In addition the students remained generally less impressed by the instructor's "stimulation of student interest" (#12), the "quality of his lectures," and his "availability out of class" (#10), than with other instructor characteristics. However, as was the case in the fall, these items continued to be rated above average by at least 50% of the respondents at each level.

The percentage of respondents rating each of the 13 instructor items above average was lowest for introductory courses and highest for graduate courses. The largest percentage differences between the two levels were for items that reflect student-teacher relationships (#'s 8, 11, 12).

Texts. Students did not react any more favorably to their texts in the spring than they did in the fall. The percentages of students who were pleased with their texts remained much lower than for most other items on the questionnaire. In the spring as in the fall, not a single text item was viewed above average by more than 40% of the students in any of the three levels, even though the upward trend from introductory courses to graduate courses was still apparent.

Course. The rating scale categories for course items were different than those for the rest of the questionnaire since category three was the perfect rating. Analysis of these items was therefore based on the percentage of students who gave a perfect rating to an item. In the spring, the highest rated aspects of the course were the "number of tests" (#19) and "class lectures" (#18) each of which was highly approved of by at least six out of every ten students at each level. Although all course items were viewed as perfect by at least 50% of the students, graduate courses did not receive the highest percentage of favorable ratings as they had for instructor and text items. For seven of the eight course items (#'s 13, 18, 24) the

---

* Wherever the words "higher" or "lower" or "significant" are used the differences are significant at the .05 level or better.

percentage of graduate students giving a perfect rating to an item was significantly smaller than the percentage in introductory courses and the mean percentage of students giving perfect ratings to all course items was 62% for introductory courses and 58% for graduate courses. The reactions of students at all levels to course items in the spring were very similar to the reactions of the students to those items in the fall with mean percentages in the fall of 60%, 60%, and 59% and in the spring of 62%, 60%, and 58% for the respective levels.

Students. Examination of the seven student items (#'s 25-31) indicates that graduate level courses once again received the highest percentages of above average ratings as they had for instructor and text items. The range of percentages among the three levels was 40% for introductory, 47% for other undergraduate and 53% for graduate level courses. A comparison of the results of the first and second evaluations shows that for introductory level courses in the spring and fall, and for graduate level courses in the two semesters, the differences between the mean percentages of above average ratings for student items were too small to be significant, however, the difference between the means of the other undergraduate courses in the spring and fall was significant, with larger percentages of students in the spring rating student items above average.

In the spring semester, graduate students continued to view themselves as better students and more interested and involved students then did undergraduates. As can be seen from Table 3, the percentages of students taking graduate courses who rated their behavior above average ranged from 35% to 67% with a mean of 53%, while the range for students taking all undergraduate courses was 19% to 65% with a mean of 44%. Student items fell into two clusters. On work items (#'s 25-28) the percentages of students at all levels who perceived their behavior above average never reached more than 50%, whereas the percentages of students who viewed the involvement-interest items in the other cluster (#'s 29-31) as above average started at 51%. This clustering held for all three levels. Larger percentages of upper classmen and graduate students indicated that their course work-habits were above average than students in introductory courses, with mean percentages of 29% in introductory courses, 36% in other undergraduate courses, and 44% in graduate courses.

In the spring semester, larger percentages of graduate students than students at either of the other two levels indicated that they had learned more than average in their courses (#32). Each of these percentages was significantly higher than it had been in the fall.

General. Thirteen items under the heading "General" were added to the questionnaire used in the fall evaluations. Seven of these items (#'s 33, 34, 36-40) were designed to elicit the

reactions of students to atypical courses such as labs, workshops seminars, studio courses, tutorials, etc., and can be meaningfully analyzed only by the instructors of those specialized courses. Items 35, 41, 42, 43, and 45 attempted to tap reactions to typical college courses, and analysis of these items shows that the percentages of graduate students who rated them above average were significantly larger than at either undergraduate level.

Responses to item 44, which was included in the first evaluation as item 33, indicate that a significantly larger percentage of graduate participants rated their courses above average than did those at the other two levels. Forty-five percent of the participants taking introductory courses, 53% of those in other undergraduate courses and 56% of those in graduate school rated their courses above average. Each of these percentages was significantly larger than in the first evaluation. About one fourth of the participants at each level indicated that they believed course evaluations were meaningful at Hofstra (#46).

School Profiles

Table 4 presents the data for each item, separately for each school within the university, and for each of the three levels of courses within each school.

Introductory courses. Students in introductory courses in each of the schools who participated in the course evaluation program in the spring, rated instructor items in about the same way as the comparable group had done in the fall. Although the mean percentages were larger than they had been in the fall the differences were not statistically significant and therefore, no different than could be expected by chance. The means for instructor items in the spring show the School of Business lowest (55%) and the School of Education highest (68%) with HCLAS in the middle (63%). This pattern of the School of Education being highest was repeated for seven of the 13 instructor items (#'s 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11). On one of the remaining items, the "quality of lectures" (#13), HCLAS had the highest percentage. On the rest (#'s 3, 4, 7, 10, 12) the students in the School of Education and HCLAS reacted similarly; both were higher than Business and each had at least 50% of the participants rating the items above average.

The rating pattern for course items was different than it had been for instructor items. For while the School of Education still had the highest percentages, there was an apparent reversal of the ordering of the remaining two schools. The School of Business now ranked second followed by HCLAS. However, the differences between the means of the School of Business and HCLAS on the one hand, and the Schools of Business and Education on the other, were not significant. The only significant difference between means for course items was that between the School of Education and HCLAS. In the spring the means for course items

Pages 12 & 13

Table 4

Profiles of Schools Within the University

Percentage of Respondents Taking Courses in HCLAS and Schools of Education and Business Rating Form 2A Items Above Average for Introductory Courses, All Other Undergraduate Courses, and Graduate Courses-Fall 1968, Spring 1969

	Introductory						Undergraduate						Graduate					
	Bus		HCLAS		Ed.		Bus.		HCLAS		Ed.		Bus		HCLAS		Ed.	
	'68	'69	'68	'69	'68	'69	'68	'69	'68	'69	'68	'69	'68	'69	'68	'69	'68	'69
No. of courses participating	(34)	(46)	(300)	(327)	(22)	(23)	(50)	(57)	(207)	(421)	(69)	(72)	(19)	(16)	(45)	(41)	(121)	(143)
PartI. Instructor. Mean.	54	55	62	63	65	68	59	62	62	67	68	68	62	77	68	69	68	70
1. Presentation of subject	50	54	60	62	65	69	55	55	60	66	63	60	62	72	61	67	62	66
2. Organization of lectures	48	54	64	66	65	71	59	57	63	67	61	58	60	80	58	66	60	64
3. Command of subject matter	74	77	83	82	75	82	81	79	82	85	80	79	82	97	90	87	84	83
4. Enthusiasm for subject	71	68	80	82	76	80	76	75	79	82	84	80	81	92	87	84	84	84
5. Enthusiasm for teaching	60	59	72	72	76	78	65	68	70	74	82	79	73	83	75	76	80	81
6. Interest in students	54	52	63	64	69	72	60	63	62	68	71	74	54	73	66	69	69	73
7. Creates classroom situation conducive to learning	47	47	57	59	59	62	52	55	57	62	62	62	57	76	59	65	61	66
8. Creates classroom situation conducive to discussions	47	56	49	56	69	74	55	65	55	62	70	74	58	74	66	69	69	74
9. Creates classroom situation conducive to questioning	55	61	57	61	69	71	60	67	60	67	72	74	59	71	69	69	68	73
10. Availability of teacher out of class	51	45	51	51	49	50	52	54	54	58	57	57	48	66	61	51	52	53
11. Consideration of opposing views	53	51	60	59	73	72	59	63	61	63	69	71	64	72	72	68	72	72
12. Stimulates students' interest	41	46	52	54	54	54	47	54	54	60	59	60	51	71	64	68	60	65
13. Quality of lectures	44	46	56	55	50	48	51	52	52	59	57	54	51	70	63	63	56	60
Part II Text. Mean.	18	18	26	25	21	25	19	20	30	30	30	29	26	34	40	33	31	34
14. Cost of text	9	12	18	19	18	20	10	13	21	22	21	27	23	25	34	22	25	29
15. Clarity of text	30	27	34	31	27	32	27	26	37	35	40	34	29	37	44	39	37	39
16. Interest level of text	16	15	25	25	19	22	20	20	32	32	30	27	36	39	42	39	32	33
Part III Course. Mean	59	64	62	63	62	68	59	61	60	60	62	59	57	62	60	56	59	60
17. Class participation	55	63	51	57	56	66	60	63	53	61	62	64	52	61	56	60	55	56
18. Class lectures	62	67	63	63	63	66	61	67	60	64	64	62	55	68	60	58	56	60
19. Number of tests	60	69	65	70	67	74	68	71	67	65	64	61	71	77	65	65	66	66
20. Quality of tests	50	55	58	58	59	73	47	54	56	55	57	51	58	67	53	49	56	54
21. Grading	60	64	67	64	60	69	53	58	60	60	60	58	55	62	62	55	58	59
22. Level of text	60	58	61	61	63	69	57	57	61	60	64	60	52	58	61	55	59	61
23. Length of assignments	67	70	69	68	65	67	68	63	66	63	66	58	59	53	68	57	63	62
24. Time necessary for preparation for this course	59	66	58	59	60	57	57	57	57	56	58	56	51	50	58	50	58	59
Part IV. Student. Mean	40	41	41	40	43	46	46	48	45	46	51	52	52	54	53	54	54	55
25. Prepared daily assignments well	33	37	36	37	36	41	40	44	40	42	50	50	48	54	46	54	48	51
26. Did much of the suggested supplementary work	26	25	32	30	33	36	33	35	34	34	45	41	42	48	44	45	45	47
27. Did much unassigned and independent course-related work	15	18	18	20	23	26	23	25	24	27	31	33	34	32	36	35	35	37
28. Participated in class discussions	35	39	31	34	41	47	39	43	34	37	47	50	47	47	46	44	46	50
29. Asked questions in class	54	56	49	51	56	59	58	58	52	56	61	64	59	59	56	60	70	62
30. Attempted to make relationships between old and new material in course	53	58	56	59	53	59	60	62	61	65	61	65	65	69	66	73	66	67
31. Attempted to make relationships between this course and others	56	57	50	52	52	53	62	66	60	64	63	62	64	66	70	70	67	69
32. Amount learned	48	53	54	56	50	53	54	57	57	62	53	54	56	70	62	70	55	60
*44. Rate your overall general impression of this course by comparing it with all your other college courses	35	42	45	45	39	38	42	51	47	54	45	47	42	62	54	58	48	54

*Question 44 was Question 33 in the first administration of the course evaluation.

were significantly higher for the Schools of Business and Education then they had been in the fall, but were not significantly different for HCLAS.

With regard to the amount learned (#32), spring semester introductory level students in the three schools reacted in about the same way. However, the significantly higher percentages in the spring in the Schools of Business and HCLAS would seem to indicate that the respondents in these schools felt that they had learned more than the participants in the fall. Although there was also an increase in the above average ratings by respondents in the School of Education it did not reach significance.

In the spring a significantly larger percentage of introductory level students gave HCLAS courses an above average rating with respect to "overall impression of course" (#44) than it gave to the courses in the School of Education. However, there was no significant difference in the way the students in the School of Business and HCLAS responded to this item. Percentage responses to this item were significantly higher in the spring than the fall for the School of Business with no differences indicated for the School of Education or HCLAS.

Other undergraduate courses. Student participants taking undergraduate courses other than introductory, reacted quite differently to instructor items than did those in introductory courses. For, though the mean for the School of Business was still the lowest, the means for the School of Education and HCLAS were very similar. Examination of the 13 instructor items shows that for five (#'s 5, 6, 8, 9, 11) the percentages were highest for the School of Education, for four (#'s 1, 2, 3, 13) the percentages were highest for HCLAS, and for the remainder (#'s 4, 7, 10, 12) the percentages were about the same for HCLAS and the School of Education. Reactions by students in both the Schools of Business and Education were about the same in the spring as they had been in the fall. However, students in HCLAS reacted more positively to instructor items in the spring than did their counterparts in the fall.

With respect to the ratings of course items, for undergraduate courses other than introductory, the differences among the schools were very small. However, significantly larger percentages of students in the School of Business indicated satisfaction with the number of tests (#19) than did students in the other two schools. On the average, students in all three schools in the spring and fall appeared to react the same to the course items.

On the two summary items, for undergraduate courses other than introductory, HCLAS ranked highest of the three schools in "amount learned" (#32) and significantly higher than the School of Education with respect to "overall impression of course" (#44). Significantly higher percentages of students in the spring than in the fall indicated that they had learned more than average in HCLAS and the School of Business.

Graduate courses. Larger percentages of graduate students in the School of Business gave above average ratings to their instructors than did graduate students in either HCLAS or the School of Education. This contrasts with the reactions of undergraduate Business School students to their instructors. In both introductory and other undergraduate courses the percentages for instructor items were smallest for the School of Business. The pattern of graduate courses in the School of Business being rated above average by the largest percentage of students held for six of the 13 instructor items (#'s 2, 3, 4, 7, 10, 13). On two of these, "command of subject matter" (#3) and "enthusiasm for subject" (#4), more than 92% of the respondents in the School of Business rated their instructors above average. On the remaining seven items (#1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12) the students in the three schools reacted quite similarly with more than 50% giving instructors above average ratings on each item. The reactions of the spring semester Business School graduate students to their instructors were much more positive than were those of their counterparts in the fall semester. Graduate students in HCLAS and School of Education reacted about the same to instructor items in the spring as they had in the fall.

The ratings of course items for graduate level courses were quite similar for the three schools. However, graduate students in the School of Business tended to be more satisfied with the number of tests (#19), and graduate students in HCLAS less satisfied with the quality of tests (#20), than were the graduate students in the other schools. Reactions of Business School graduate students to course items were significantly higher in the spring than they had been in the fall whereas, the respondents in the other schools reacted about the same in the spring as they had in the fall.

With respect to the amount learned (#32), HCLAS and the School of Business had the highest percentages. However, compared to ratings in the fall, significantly larger percentages of graduate students in all three schools in the spring indicated that they had learned more than average in their courses.

Graduate students in all three schools reacted quite similarly to "overall impression of course" (#44). For the Schools of Business and Education, graduate level percentages were significantly higher in the spring than in the fall for this item.

Summary

Course evaluations at Hofstra University in the spring of 1969 resulted in the evaluation of 64% of 1893 courses. More than 85% of the students registered in those courses returned 20,428 separate evaluations.

Course participation varied from department to department and from one sub-unit to another. The extent of participation ranged from 0% of the courses in some of the LAS departments and 11% in the

department of Natural Science, to 100% of the courses in the American Studies Program, Social Science and Religion, and the LAS II English department. The mean course participation rates by sub-units within the university were: School of Business 76%; School of Education 75%; Social Sciences 67%; Humanities 61%; HCLAS 60%; LAS Unit II 48%; Sciences 48%; and LAS Unit I 46%. In general, the participation was greatest for the introductory courses (mean 70%) and smallest for the graduate courses (mean 59%) with the other undergraduate courses being in between (mean 63%).

The results of the evaluations show that for the different levels within the university, on the average, graduate courses received the highest percentages of above average ratings for all items except course items. On course items, students in undergraduate introductory courses reacted more positively than students taking either graduate or other undergraduate courses.

The profiles of the three schools in the university show that: for introductory courses the School of Education received the most positive reactions for instructor and course items; for other undergraduate courses, the School of Business received the least positive reactions for instructor items; and for graduate courses the School of Business received the most positive reactions for instructor items. On one summary item "amount learned" (#32) HCLAS was rated above average by the largest percentage of respondents in undergraduate courses other than introductory courses, and both HCLAS and School of Business were rated above average by the largest percentages of respondents in graduate school. On the other summary item "overall impression of course" (#44) all undergraduates reacted more positively to HCLAS than to the School of Education.

A comparison of the results obtained in the fall and spring evaluations indicates that while participation throughout the University was greater in the fall, student's reactions, in general, to their instructors, the amount they learned and their overall impressions of courses were more favorable in the spring.